



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 4, 2004

Mr. Juan J. Cruz
Escamilla & Poneck, Inc.
5219 McPherson, Suite 306
Laredo, Texas 78041

OR2004-6592

Dear Mr. Cruz:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 206437.

The United Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received three separate requests for a former district employee's personnel file, a police report or any information relating to a specified incident, and a copy of the district and TEA policies relating to student-teacher relationships. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, 552.114, 552.117, and 552.1325 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

First, we note that a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 261.201(a) provides as follows:

(a) The following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, and working papers used or developed in

an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). The information at issue is an offense report created by the district's police department as a result of an investigation into alleged injury to a child. Because the information that we have marked consists of files, reports, records, communications, or working papers used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261, the information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. You have not indicated that the district's police department has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume that no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, the information at issue is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code as information made confidential by law.¹

You also raise section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355 provides that "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." Educ. Code § 21.355. This office has interpreted section 21.355 to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or an administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In that decision, we determined that the word "teacher," for purposes of section 21.355, is a person who is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code or a school district teaching permit under section 21.055 and who is engaged in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id* at 4. We also concluded that the word "administrator" in section 21.355 means a person who is required to and does in fact hold an administrator's certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and is performing the functions of an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.*

You state that a portion of the submitted information consists of teacher evaluations. Assuming that the individual who is the subject of this information held a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code or a school district teaching permit under section 21.055 and was engaged in teaching at the time of the evaluation, we conclude that the information we have marked is confidential in its entirety under section 21.355 of the Education Code and must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Next, you contend that some of the remaining submitted information is confidential under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C.

¹ As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we do not address your claims under sections 552.108 and 552.1325.

§ 1232g(b)(1). FERPA provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information, other than directory information, contained in a student's education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student's parent. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1); *see also* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining personally identifiable information). FERPA is incorporated into chapter 552 of the Government Code by section 552.026, which provides as follows:

This chapter does not require the release of information contained in education records of an educational agency or institution, except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, Sec. 513, Pub. L. No. 93-380, 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1232g.

Gov't Code § 552.026. "Education records" under FERPA are those records that contain information directly related to a student and that are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for such agency or institution. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(A).

Section 552.114(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a student record at an educational institution funded wholly or partly by state revenue." This office generally has treated "student record" information under section 552.114(a) as the equivalent of "education record" information that is protected by FERPA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 634 at 5 (1995). In Open Records Decision No. 634 (1995), this office concluded that: (1) an educational agency or institution may withhold from disclosure information that is protected by FERPA and excepted from disclosure by sections 552.026 and 552.101 of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to those exceptions to disclosure, and (2) an educational agency or institution that is state-funded may withhold from disclosure information that is excepted from disclosure by section 552.114 of the Government Code as a "student record," insofar as the "student record" is protected by FERPA, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to that exception to disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision No. 634 at 6-8 (1995). However, since in this instance you have requested our decision on the public availability of these portions of the submitted information under FERPA, we will address your claims.

You inform us that portions of the remaining submitted documents contain information relating to a student. Generally, FERPA requires that information be withheld from the public only to the extent reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a particular student. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 332 at 3 (1982), 206 at 2 (1978). We have marked the information that is confidential under FERPA. The district must not release the marked information unless it has authority under FERPA to do so.

We next address your privacy claims under sections 552.101 and 552.102. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would

constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.— Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. We will therefore consider your claims regarding section 552.101 and section 552.102 together.

Common-law privacy protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Prior decisions of this office have also found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps); personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990), 523 (1989) (individual’s mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982).

Upon review, we find that a small portion of this information, which we have marked, is protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy. Accordingly, we conclude that the district must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy. We note, however, that the public has a legitimate interest in information concerning the workplace conduct and performance of public employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 423 (1984). Having reviewed the remaining submitted information, we conclude that none of it is protected by common-law privacy, and it may not be withheld on that basis. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (public employee’s job performance does not generally constitute his private affairs), 444 (1986) (public has interest in public employee’s qualifications and performance and circumstances of his resignation or termination), 405 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs his job); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining submitted information under section 552.101 or 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

You also assert section 552.102(b) of the Government Code. Section 552.102(b) excepts from disclosure most information on a transcript from an institution of higher education

maintained in the personnel files of professional public school employees. Gov't Code § 552.102(b). Section 552.102(b) excepts from disclosure all information from transcripts other than the employee's name, the courses taken, and the degree obtained. Open Records Decision No. 526 (1989). Thus, with the exception of the employee's name, the courses taken, and the degree obtained, the district must withhold the information in the submitted transcripts pursuant to section 552.102(b).

Next, you claim that a small portion of the remaining submitted information is confidential pursuant to section 552.107. Section 552.107(1) protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002).

First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Because government attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, including as administrators, investigators, or managers, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Finally, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was "not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication." *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets the definition of a confidential communication depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein). Having considered your representations and reviewed the information at issue, we find that you have established that a small portion of the submitted information

constitutes privileged attorney-client communications. We therefore find that the information we have marked may be withheld pursuant to section 552.107.

We now address your section 552.111 claim for a portion of the remaining submitted information. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, and opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.).

An agency’s policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5. In this instance, we conclude that the remaining submitted information does not include “intraagency communications consisting of advice, opinion, or recommendations on policymaking matters,” but instead concerns internal administrative or personnel matters. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.111.

You also assert that section 552.117 is applicable to a portion of the remaining submitted information. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from public disclosure the present and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely request that such information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the district may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made.

We note that the submitted information contains an election form dated November 20, 2000. The named former district employee elected to release her home address and home telephone number to the public and failed to make an election regarding her social security number and family member information. As such, the district may not withhold any of this information under section 552.117.

We note, however, that the social security number may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social

Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained and maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no basis for concluding that the social security number at issue is confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential information. Prior to releasing any social security number, the district should ensure that it did not obtain or maintain the social security number pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

We note that a portion of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, we conclude that the district must withhold the Texas driver's license number we have marked pursuant to section 552.130.

We also note that the remaining submitted information contains an e-mail address that is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the public" but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). We have marked the e-mail address that the district must withhold under section 552.137 unless the owner has affirmatively consented to its release.

Finally, we note that the remaining submitted information contains an examinee score report that is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code, section 21.355 of

the Education Code, and common-law privacy. The district must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to FERPA. The district must also withhold the transcripts we have marked under section 552.102(b) of the Government Code, with the exception of the employee's name, courses taken, and degree obtained. The district may withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The social security number we have marked may be confidential under federal law. The district must withhold the Texas driver's license number we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Unless the district has received affirmative consent to release the marked e-mail address, it must withhold the e-mail address pursuant to section 552.137. The copyrighted information must be released in accordance with copyright law. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Debbie K. Lee
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DKL/seg

Ref: ID# 206437

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Mayra Flores
Laredo Morning Times
111 Esperanza Drive
Laredo, Texas 78041
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Christina Garcia
CBS-13 KVTV
2600 Shea and Anna Street
Laredo, Texas 78041
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Marissa Rodríguez Limón
Univisión 27
222 Bob Bullock Loop
Laredo, Texas 78043
(w/o enclosures)